

### **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicant sincerely thanks Examiners Mirzadegan and Shaw for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's representative, David W. Foster, on April 17, 2008.

During the interview, Applicant's representative respectfully traversed the Office's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 second paragraph, 101, 102(e), and 103(a). For instance, Applicant's representative respectfully submitted that the cited combination ("Colrain" in view of "Shirvastava") fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "*propagating* the notification information from the first server module to at least a second server module" as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

Applicant's representative understood Examiners Mirzadegan and Shaw to agree that the proposed amendments obviated the grounds for the drawing objections, disclosure objections, 112 rejections, and 101 rejections. In addition, Applicant's representative understood Examiners Mirzadegan and Shaw be receptive to potential amendments obviating the grounds for the 102 and 103 rejections. For instance, Examiner Mirzadegan suggested further clarifying that "a first server" comprises an "application server", and that a first application server propagates notification information to a second application server. However, no formal agreement was achieved.